arXiv:gr-qc/9508033v1 14 Aug 1995

NBI-HE-95-24
gr-qc/9508033
August 1995

Field Theory As Free Fall

J. Greensite[1] [2]

The Niels Bohr Institute
Blegdamsvej 17
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø
Denmark

Abstract

It is shown that the classical field equations pertaining to gravity coupled to other bosonic fields are equivalent to a single geodesic equation, describing the free fall of a point particle in superspace. Some implications for quantum gravity are discussed.

[1]Permanent address: Physics and Astronomy Dept., San Francisco State University, San Francisco CA 94132 USA
[2]email: greensit@stars.sfsu.edu

1 Introduction

In the canonical formulation of general relativity, it is customary to view the time-evolution of the three metric $g_{ij}(x)$, as well as the evolution of any other non-gravitational fields $\phi^A(x)$, as tracing out a trajectory in the "space of all fields" known as superspace. In this article I will show that the classical equations of motion and constraints, which govern the dynamics of g_{ij} and ϕ^A, are equivalent to a geodesic equation in superspace, with a certain supermetric that will be specified. Field theory in general relativity may therefore be regarded as describing the free fall of a point particle in a (super) gravitational field. Connections to Jacobi's principle in mechanics, implications for quantization (in particular, the problem of time in quantum gravity), and possible generalizations, will also be discussed below.

2 Geodesics in Superspace

Let $\{q^a(x), p_a(x),\ a = 1, 2, ..., n_f\}$ denote the canonical variables of a set of integer-spin fields including gravity, i.e. $\{q^a(x)\} = \{g_{ij}(x), \phi^A(x)\}$, with the non-gravitational fields scaled by an appropriate power of Newton's constant so as to be dimensionless.[3] The first-order ADM action has the form

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int d^4x \, [p_a \partial_t q^a - N\mathcal{H}_x - N_i \mathcal{H}_x^i] \\ \mathcal{H}_x &= \kappa^2 G^{ab} p_a p_b + \sqrt{g} U(q) \\ \mathcal{H}_x^i &= O^{ia}[q, \partial_x] p_a \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

leading to the dynamical equations and constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t q^a(x) &= \int d^3x' \, \left[N \frac{\delta}{\delta p_a(x)} \mathcal{H} + N_i \frac{\delta}{\delta p_a(x)} \mathcal{H}^i \right] \\ \partial_t p_a(x) &= -\int d^3x' \, \left[N \frac{\delta}{\delta q^a(x)} \mathcal{H} + N_i \frac{\delta}{\delta q^a(x)} \mathcal{H}^i \right] \\ \mathcal{H} &= 0 \\ \mathcal{H}^i &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

As pointed out by Moncrief and Teitelboim [1], the supermomentum constraints $\mathcal{H}^i = 0$ need not be imposed independently. These constraints are implied by the requirement that the Hamiltonian constraints $\mathcal{H} = 0$ are preserved by the time evolution, which demands the vanishing of the Poisson brackets $\{\mathcal{H}(x), \mathcal{H}(y)\}$. Since these Poisson brackets turn out to be linear in $\mathcal{H}^i$, the momentum constraint follows.

[3] I will work here entirely in the metric ($g_{\mu\nu}$) formalism; spinor fields will not be discussed.

To help fix the notation, we note that for pure gravity, where the conjugate variables are the three metric g_{ij} and corresponding momenta p^{ij}, the various expressions in the ADM action are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \{a = 1-6\} &\leftrightarrow \{(i,j),\ i \le j\} \\ q^a(x) &\leftrightarrow g_{ij}(x) \\ p_a(x) &\leftrightarrow \begin{cases} p^{ij}(x) & (i=j) \\ 2p^{ij}(x) & (i<j) \end{cases} \\ G_{ab}(x) &\leftrightarrow G^{ijnm}(x) \\ \sqrt{g}U &= -\frac{1}{\kappa^2}\sqrt{g}\ {}^3R \\ \mathcal{H}^i &= -2p^{ik}{}_{;k} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where G_{ijkl} is the DeWitt superspace metric

$$G_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{g}}(g_{ik}g_{jl} + g_{il}g_{jk} - g_{ij}g_{kl}) \tag{4}$$

In this case, the Hamilton equations plus constraints (2) are equivalent to the vacuum Einstein equations.

The lapse and shift functions N and N_i foliate spacetime into space + time, and set the coordinates on each constant-time hypersurface. If one sets $N_i = 0$, it is still possible to choose arbitrary foliations using the lapse function, although the coordinates on each time-slice are then fixed. It is also possible, without affecting the freedom to choose arbitrary foliations, to limit the lapse functions N to a subset $N = \tilde{N}$ satisfying

$$\int d^3x\ \tilde{N}\sqrt{g}U(q) = \sigma \tag{5}$$

where σ is an arbitrary parameter with dimensions of mass. Equivalently,

$$\tilde{N} = \frac{\sigma\mathcal{N}}{\int d^3x \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U(q)} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is unconstrained. The global constraint (5), like the choice $N_i = 0$, does not limit the choice of constant-time hypersurfaces; it only affects the value of the label t assigned to each hypersurface. Making the gauge choices

$$N_i = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad N = \tilde{N} \tag{7}$$

the 1st-order equations of motion and constraints become

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t q^a(x) &= 2\tilde{N}\kappa^2 G^{ab}p_b(x) \\ \partial_t p_a(x) &= -\int d^3x' \tilde{N}\frac{\delta}{\delta q^a(x)}\mathcal{H} \\ \mathcal{H} &= \kappa^2 G^{ab}p_a p_b + \sqrt{g}U = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The supermomentum constraints have been dropped, since they are implied by the other equations. We go to the 2nd-order form by solving the first of these equations for p_a

$$p_a = \frac{1}{2\tilde{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_t q^b \tag{9}$$

and inserting into the second two equations of (8), to get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left[\frac{1}{2\tilde{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_t q^b\right] - \frac{1}{4\tilde{N}\kappa^2}\frac{\partial G_{cd}}{\partial q^a}\partial_t q^c \partial_t q^d + \int d^3x' \; \tilde{N}\frac{\delta}{\delta q^a(x)}(\sqrt{g}U) = 0 \tag{10}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{4\tilde{N}^2\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_t q^a \partial_t q^b + \sqrt{g}U = 0 \tag{11}$$

as the classical field equations with lapse/shift conditions (7).

Let us now introduce some notation. Define a mixed discrete/continuous index (α, x) as a "coordinate index" in superspace

$$q^{(\alpha x)} \equiv q^\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(x) & \alpha = 0 \\ q^a(x) & \alpha = a \neq 0 \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Apart from notation, we are enlarging the definition of superspace to include the field $\mathcal{N}(x)$, which appears in eq. (6). The summation convention for tensor indices is then

$$V_{..(\alpha x)..}W^{..(\alpha x)..} \equiv \sum_\alpha \int d^3x \; V_{..(\alpha x)..}W^{..(\alpha x)..} \tag{13}$$

We are now ready to state the main results:

I. The equation of motion (10) and Hamiltonian constraint (11) are the equations of a geodesic in superspace, with the time label t an affine parameter in superspace, proportional to the proper-time along the geodesic;

II. Both the equation of motion (10) and the constraint (11) are obtained by extremizing the proper-time of the path in superspace, such that the affine parameter t, given by

$$t = \frac{1}{\sigma}\int d\tau \sqrt{-\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}\frac{dq^{(\alpha x)}}{d\tau}\frac{dq^{(\beta y)}}{d\tau}} \tag{14}$$

is stationary with respect to variations of $q^{(\alpha x)}(\tau)$, where the (degenerate) metric of superspace is proportional to

$$\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)} = \begin{cases} \left[\int d^3x' \, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]\frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}(x)\kappa^2}G_{ab}(x)\delta^3(x-y) & \alpha = a, \quad \beta = b \\ 0 & \alpha = 0 \;\; \text{and/or} \;\; \beta = 0 \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

The equation of motion (10) is obtained from the stationarity condition

$$\frac{\delta t}{\delta q^{(ax)}(\tau)} = 0 \tag{16}$$

with discrete index $a \neq 0$. Taking the indicated functional derivative of (14), we find

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\left\{ \frac{\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}}{\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}} \frac{1}{2\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\frac{dq^b}{d\tau}\right\} \\ &- \frac{\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}}{\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}} \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2}\frac{\partial G_{cd}}{\partial q^a}\frac{dq^c}{d\tau}\frac{dq^d}{d\tau} \\ &+ \frac{\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}}{\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}} \int dx'''\, \mathcal{N}\frac{\delta}{\delta q^a}(\sqrt{g}U) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Defining $\tilde{N}$ according to eq. (6), this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\left\{ \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sigma}\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}} \frac{1}{2\tilde{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\frac{dq^b}{d\tau}\right\} \\ &- \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sigma}\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}} \frac{1}{4\tilde{N}\kappa^2}\frac{\partial G_{cd}}{\partial q^a}\frac{dq^c}{d\tau}\frac{dq^d}{d\tau} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sigma}\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2} \int dx'''\, \tilde{N}\frac{\delta}{\delta q^a}(\sqrt{g}U) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and then using

$$\begin{aligned} dt &= \frac{1}{\sigma}\sqrt{-\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}\frac{dq^{(\alpha x)}}{d\tau}\frac{dq^{(\beta y)}}{d\tau}}\, d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma}\left[\int d^3x''\, \mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}\left[-\int d^3x' \, \frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a \partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2} d\tau \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\frac{1}{2\tilde{N}\kappa^2} G_{ab}\frac{dq^b}{dt}\right\} - \frac{1}{4\tilde{N}\kappa^2}\frac{\partial G_{cd}}{\partial q^a}\frac{dq^c}{dt}\frac{dq^d}{dt} + \int dx' \, \tilde{N}\frac{\delta}{\delta q^a}(\sqrt{g}U) = 0 \tag{20}$$

which is identical to the classical equation of motion (10).

The Hamiltonian constraint is obtained from the remaining stationarity condition

$$\frac{\delta t}{\delta q^{(0x)}(\tau)} = \frac{\delta t}{\delta \mathcal{N}(x,\tau)} = 0 \tag{21}$$

Again taking the indicated functional derivative gives

$$\frac{\left[\int d^3x''\,\mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}}{\left[-\int d^3x'\,\frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2}G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a\partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}}\frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}^2\kappa^2}G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a\partial_\tau q^b$$
$$+\frac{\left[-\int d^3x'\,\frac{1}{4\mathcal{N}\kappa^2}G_{ab}\partial_\tau q^a\partial_\tau q^b\right]^{1/2}}{\left[\int d^3x''\,\mathcal{N}\sqrt{g}U\right]^{1/2}}\sqrt{g}U=0 \tag{22}$$

and using (6) and (19) we find

$$\frac{1}{4\tilde{N}^2\kappa^2}G_{ab}\frac{dq^a}{dt}\frac{dq^b}{dt}+\sqrt{g}U=0 \tag{23}$$

which is simply the Hamiltonian constraint (11). Consistency of the Hamiltonian constraint with the equations of motion (10) then implies the supermomentum constraints. In this way, the full set of classical field equations and constraints are obtained from the requirement

$$\frac{\delta t}{\delta q^{(\alpha x)}(\tau)}=0 \tag{24}$$

verifying the results (I) and (II) stated above. Note that equations (10) and (11) are covariant with respect to a change in the mass parameter σ; the increment of proper time on the 4-manifold, namely $\tilde{N}dt$, is σ-independent. The constant σ is completely arbitrary, and has been introduced only to give the evolution parameter t the dimensions of time. From the point of view of the ADM equations of motion, a change of σ is just a relabeling of the time variable t; from the point of view of the geodesic condition, it is simply a rescaling of the affine parameter.

If, instead of using the explicit form (15) of the supermetric $\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}$, the supermetric is left arbitrary, then variation of t by $q^\alpha(x)$ leads, by standard manipulations, to the equation

$$\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}\frac{d^2q^{(\beta y)}}{dt^2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}}{\delta q^{(\gamma z)}}+\frac{\delta\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\gamma z)}}{\delta q^{(\beta y)}}-\frac{\delta\mathcal{G}_{(\beta y)(\gamma z)}}{\delta q^{(\alpha x)}}\right)\frac{dq^{(\beta y)}}{dt}\frac{dq^{(\gamma z)}}{dt}=0 \tag{25}$$

Inserting the supermetric (15), it is not difficult to verify explicitly that the $\alpha=0$ component of this equation is the Hamiltonian constraint (11), while the $\alpha=a\neq 0$ components are just the field equations (10). If the metric were invertible, one could multiply this expression by the reciprocal metric, and obtain the usual form of the geodesic equation

$$\frac{d^2q^{(\alpha x)}}{dt^2}+\Gamma^{(\alpha x)}_{(\beta y)(\gamma z)}\frac{dq^{(\beta y)}}{dt}\frac{dq^{(\gamma z)}}{dt}=0 \tag{26}$$

where $\Gamma^{(\alpha x)}_{(\beta y)(\gamma z)}$ is the connection corresponding to the supermetric $\mathcal{G}_{(ax)(by)}$. This supermetric is not invertible, however, and there is no term involving a second derivative $d^2\mathcal{N}/dt^2$. As a result, there is not one, but rather a continuously infinite set of trajectories $\{q^a(x,t), \mathcal{N}(x,t)\}$ which extremize the proper time in superspace, proportional to the affine parameter t, between given initial $q^{(\alpha x)}_{in}$ and final $q^{(\alpha x)}_f$ configurations. This is as it should be. Each geodesic (a solution of the field equations), satisfying given initial and final boundary conditions, represents a different foliation, corresponding to a particular choice of lapse, of a certain 4-manifold. The set of all such geodesics, corresponding to all possible foliations of the same 4-manifold, forms an equivalence class.[4] Thus the non-invertibility of the supermetric, which leads to an infinite degeneracy in solutions for a geodesic, is just a consequence of the (ordinary) time diffeomorphism invariance in four-dimensional space, which allows for an infinite number of possible foliations.

If a set of stationary paths between two points in superspace are just different representations of the same 4-manifold (+ non-gravitational fields), then one would expect that the "proper time" interval in superspace along each path would be the same. In fact, the proper time in superspace, along a geodesic joining two configurations $\{q^a_{in}(x)\}$ and $\{q^a_f(x)\}$ is proportional to the diffeomorphism invariant action

$$S = \int d^4x \ \left[-\frac{1}{\kappa^2}\sqrt{g}R + \mathcal{L}_{non-grav}(g_{\mu\nu}, \phi^A) \right] \quad + \quad \text{boundary terms} \tag{27}$$

evaluated on a solution of the equations of motion bounded by the given initial and final configurations. To derive the proportionality of t and S, begin with the definition of the affine parameter t in superspace

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\mathcal{G}_{(ax)(by)}\frac{dq^{(ax)}}{dt}\frac{dq^{(by)}}{dt} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma}\int d^3x \ \frac{1}{4\tilde{N}\kappa^2}G_{ab}\frac{dq^a}{dt}\frac{dq^b}{dt} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Solving the Hamiltonian constraint (11) for $\tilde{N}$ gives

$$\tilde{N} = \sqrt{-\frac{1}{4\kappa^2\sqrt{g}U}G_{ab}\frac{dq^a}{dt}\frac{dq^b}{dt}} \tag{29}$$

and substituting this expression into (28) we have

$$1 = \frac{1}{\sigma}\int d^3x \sqrt{-\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\sqrt{g}UG_{ab}\frac{dq^a}{dt}\frac{dq^b}{dt}} \tag{30}$$

[4]There may be more than one equivalence class, since there many be more than one 4-manifold solving the equations of motion, bounded by q_{in} and q_f.

or

$$dt = \frac{1}{\sigma}\int d^3x\,\sqrt{-\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\sqrt{g}UG_{ab}dq^a dq^b} \tag{31}$$

Then

$$t = \frac{1}{\sigma}\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\sqrt{g}UG_{ab}\frac{dq^a}{dx^0}\frac{dq^b}{dx^0}} \tag{32}$$

The integral in eq. (32) is the Baierlein-Sharp-Wheeler form of the action (27), in "shift gauge" $N_i = 0$; it is obtained from the ADM action by solving for the momenta and the lapse function in terms of the velocities [2]. The value of the BSW action, evaluated along a stationary path, is equal to the diffeomorphism-invariant action (27) evaluated along the same path. Because of diffeomorphism invariance, any geodesic in an equivalence class, subject to given initial and final boundary conditions, will have the same action S. Therefore, since

$$t = \frac{1}{\sigma}S \tag{33}$$

evaluated along the geodesic, all geodesics between given end-points in superspace, which differ (in 4-space) only by a foliation, have the same interval of proper time in superspace.

3 Jacobi's Principle

The stationarity of t in (14) is closely related to Jacobi's principle in classical non-relativistic mechanics. Consider a particle of energy E, whose motion in a D-dimensional space is governed by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}K^{ab}(x)p_a p_b + V(x) \tag{34}$$

According to Jacobi's principle, the path traced out in x-space by the particle trajectory $x(\tau)$ extremizes the quantity

$$s = \int d\tau\sqrt{\mathcal{G}_{ab}\frac{dx^a}{d\tau}\frac{dx^b}{d\tau}} \tag{35}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_{ab} = (E - V)mK_{ab} \tag{36}$$

and where K_{ab} is inverse to K^{ab}. The similarity of these expressions to (14) and (15) is obvious. Despite these similarities, one would not say that a non-relativistic particle moving in an arbitrary potential is in free fall. For one thing, the Euler-Lagrange equations for a non-relativistic particle involve the mass parameter m,

while the geodesic equation derived from Jacobi's principle does not. Jacobi's principle only concerns the parametrized orbit $x^a(\tau)$, while the Euler-Lagrange equations deal with the trajectory $x^a(T)$ in terms of the Newtonian time T. To obtain the Euler-Lagrange equations, it is necessary to introduce an additional condition

$$\frac{1}{2}mK_{ab}\frac{dx^a}{dT}\frac{dx^b}{dT} + V = E \tag{37}$$

which defines the Newtonian time T. The mass parameter enters the equations of motion at this point. Since the geodesic equation by itself is *not* equivalent to the Euler-Lagrange equations, the motion of a non-relativistic particle in an arbitrary potential is not equivalent to free fall.

On the other hand, consider the relativistic action

$$S = -m\int d\tau\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}(x)\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau}} \tag{38}$$

In this case, the parametrized trajectory $x^\mu(\tau)$ contains all there is to know about the particle's motion; the Euler-Lagrange equations and the geodesic equation are equivalent, and do not involve the particle mass m. The action (38) therefore describes a particle in free fall.

Free fall, for a relativistic particle, can be reformulated as the motion of a particle in a certain kind of potential. To see this, consider an arbitrary factoring of $g_{\mu\nu}$ into two parts

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x) = \phi(x)G_{\mu\nu}(x) \tag{39}$$

Then the first-order form of the action (38) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int d\tau\,[p_\mu\partial_\tau x^\mu - N\mathcal{H}] \\ \mathcal{H} &= \frac{1}{2m}G^{\mu\nu}p_\mu p_\nu + \frac{1}{2}m\phi(x) \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

This is verified by first solving for the momenta in terms of the velocities using $\partial_\tau x^\mu = N\partial\mathcal{H}/\partial p_\mu$, then solving for the lapse function N from the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H} = 0$, and finally substituting the results into the first-order action in (40). The square-root action (38) follows. Note, however, that the Hamiltonian constraint can be written as

$$G^{\mu\nu}p_\mu p_\nu + m^2\phi(x) = 0 \tag{41}$$

This equation can be interpreted as referring to a particle moving in a spacetime of background metric $G_{\mu\nu}$, with a "position-dependent mass" $m\sqrt{\phi(x)}$. Therefore, the motion of a particle in a manifold of metric $G_{\mu\nu}$, with a position-dependent

mass, is simply a different way of formulating the free fall of particle in a manifold of metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, with a constant mass. Note again the similarity to the Jacobi form (35) and (36). In this case, $\mathcal{G}_{ab},\ K_{ab},\ mV(x)$ in (36) correspond to $g_{\mu\nu},\ G_{\mu\nu},\ \phi(x)$, respectively, with $E = 0$.

Now in gravitation theory, the metric of superspace is usually taken to be the ultralocal DeWitt metric

$$G_{(ax)(by)} = G_{ab}[g_{ij}(x)]\delta^3(x - y) \tag{42}$$

and the term $\sqrt{g}U$ in the Hamiltonian is viewed as the potential. In close analogy to the position-dependent mass term of a relativistic particle, the potential term in the ADM Hamiltonian can be absorbed into a redefinition of the metric (eq. (15)), and we arrive at the action principle (14). Taking $\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}$, rather than $G_{(ax)(by)}$, as the supermetric, the dynamical field equations decribe the free fall of a point particle through superspace. As in the case of the relativistic particle, the geodesic equation is equivalent to the classical equations of motion, and a given geodesic $q^\alpha(x, t)$ through superspace provides a complete description of the dynamics. No additional information, analogous to the definition of Newtonian time in (37), is required, and no constants (analogous to mass) not appearing in the geodesic equation are needed.

It should be noted that there has been some previous work on the topic of Jacobi's principle in general relativity, by Brown and York [3]. In their approach the cosmological constant is interpreted as being analogous to an energy parameter. This entails a modification of classical relativity (the unimodular theory [4]) in which the cosmological constant is taken to be a dynamical degree of freedom, much like the energy E of a non-relativistic theory, which is conjugate to another variable interpreted as a time-evolution parameter. The motivation for introducing such a parameter was to address the problem of time in quantum gravity. As in the non-relativistic case, the equations of motion in this particular time parameter are not geodesic equations. The reader is referred to ref. [3] for further details concerning this approach.

4 Quantization

We next consider the first-order formulation of free fall in superspace; the object is to find the quantity whose Poisson brackets evolve the system in the affine parameter t.

In ordinary 4-space, the geodesic equation is obtained by variation of

$$s = \int d\tau \, \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\partial_\tau x^\mu \partial_\tau x^\nu} \tag{43}$$

with respect to x^μ, and then using

$$ds = \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\partial_\tau x^\mu \partial_\tau x^\nu}\, d\tau \tag{44}$$

to replace the arbitrary parameter τ with the proper-time s in the resulting equations of motion. As is well known [5], the geodesic equation is also obtained by varying the action

$$S = m_0 \int dt \, \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^\mu}{dt} \frac{dx^\nu}{dt} \tag{45}$$

with respect to $x^\mu(t)$. This leads directly to a geodesic equation

$$\frac{d^2 x^\mu}{dt^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta} \frac{dx^\alpha}{dt} \frac{dx^\beta}{dt} = 0 \tag{46}$$

where the affine parameter t is proportional to the interval in proper time s. Going to a first-order formulation of the action (45)

$$S = \int dt \, \left[p_\mu \partial_t x^\mu - \frac{1}{2m_0} g^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu \right] \tag{47}$$

we see that the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &\equiv -\frac{p^2}{m_0^2} \\ &= -g_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^\mu}{dt} \frac{dx^\nu}{dt} \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

is a constant of motion, and therefore, using (44),

$$ds = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}}\, dt \tag{49}$$

This is the relationship between the evolution parameter t, and the proper time s. Note that the action (45) has no constraint on the mass $m^2 = -p^2 = \mathcal{E} m_0^2$ of the particle, which is treated simply as a constant of motion. This mass, of course, cannot be determined from the particle trajectory (a geodesic) in configuration space.

In the same way, the equations of motion (10) and constraint (11) in superspace are obtained by variation of the action

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{\sigma_0} \int dt \, \mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)} \frac{dq^{(\alpha x)}}{dt} \frac{dq^{(\beta y)}}{dt} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma_0} \int dt \, \mathcal{G}_{(ax)(by)} \frac{dq^{(ax)}}{dt} \frac{dq^{(by)}}{dt} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Going over to the first-order formulation in the usual way, we find

$$S = \int dt \ \left(p_{(ax)} \frac{dq^{(ax)}}{dt} - Æ \right) \tag{51}$$

where

$$Æ = \frac{1}{4} \sigma_0 \mathcal{G}^{(ax)(by)} p_{(ax)} p_{(by)} \tag{52}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}^{(ax)(by)} = \frac{1}{\int d^3x' \, \mathcal{N} \sqrt{g} U} 4 \mathcal{N} \kappa^2 G^{ab} \delta^3(x-y) \tag{53}$$

The quantity Æ is a constant of motion, denoted $Æ = -\mathcal{E}\sigma_0$, of the corresponding dynamical equations

$$\frac{dq^{(ax)}}{dt} = \frac{\delta Æ}{\delta p_{(ax)}} \quad , \qquad \frac{dp_{(ax)}}{dt} = -\frac{\delta Æ}{\delta q^{(ax)}} \quad , \qquad 0 = \frac{\delta Æ}{\delta \mathcal{N}(x)} \tag{54}$$

It is straightforward to verify that eq. (54) reproduces the equations of motion (10) and constraint (11), upon solving for the momenta in terms of velocities, and identifying $\sigma = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}}\sigma_0$ in $\tilde{N}$.

In contrast to the usual Hamiltonian of general relativity, the quantity $Æ[q, p, \mathcal{N}]$ is *not* constrained to be zero, although the constraint equation (11) is obtained from variation with respect to $\mathcal{N}$. The value $Æ = -\sigma_0 \mathcal{E}$ is a constant of motion, which, however, cannot be determined from the trajectory followed in superspace. For $Æ = -\sigma_0 \mathcal{E}$, the constraint $\delta Æ / \delta \mathcal{N} = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{E}}_x = \frac{\kappa^2}{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}} G^{ab} p_a p_b + \sqrt{\mathcal{E}} \sqrt{g} U = 0 \tag{55}$$

This looks like the usual Hamiltonian constraint, apart from the presence of a free parameter $\mathcal{E}$. In fact, the parameter $\mathcal{E}$ is irrelevant to the configuration-space equations of motion. This is seen by starting from the Hamiltonian equations of motion based on $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{E}}_x$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dq^{(ax)}}{d\tau} &= \int d^3x' \ N(x') \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{E}}_{x'}}{\delta p_{(ax)}} \\ \frac{dp_{(ax)}}{d\tau} &= -\int d^3x' \ N(x') \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{E}}_{x'}}{\delta q^{(ax)}} \\ \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{E}}_x &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

and solving for the momenta in terms of velocities. One then finds that the parameter $\mathcal{E}$ drops out of the resulting second-order equations of motion and constraint.

This means that the constant $\mathcal{E}$, like the mass of a particle in free fall, or the tension of the Nambu string, or the value of Newton's constant in vacuum gravity,[5] doesn't appear in the Euler-Lagrange equations of the theory, and hence cannot be determined from the classical trajectories in configuration space. In this sense, $\mathcal{E}$ is an undetermined constant. The existence and implications of such constants in Hamiltonian constraints has been discussed in ref. [8].

The dynamical equations (54) can be rewritten in Poisson bracket form

$$\frac{d}{dt}Q[q,p] = \{Q, Æ\} \ , \qquad \frac{\delta Æ}{\delta \mathcal{N}(x)} = 0 \tag{57}$$

Since Æ is a constant of motion whose value at the classical level is unconstrained, and since the equations (54) are equivalent to the field equations of general relativity,[6] it seems reasonable to base the canonical quantization of gravity on the Schrodinger equation corresponding to the Poisson bracket of eq. (57), i.e.

$$i\hbar\frac{d\Psi}{dt} = Æ\Psi \qquad \text{(any } \mathcal{N}) \tag{58}$$

thereby avoiding the notorious "problem of time" in quantum gravity [6]. In fact, this proposal has been made and developed by Carlini and the author in a series of papers [7]-[9], following a different line of reasoning. One of the advantages of this proposal, discussed in more detail in the cited references, is that it allows for the existence of physical states which are eigenstates of non-stationary observables. Because a physical state can only depend on the configuration-space variables $\{q^a(x)\}$, and not on $\mathcal{N}(x)$, such states must satisfy (58) for any choice of $\mathcal{N}$. Expanding a time-dependent solution in terms of stationary states

$$\Psi[q,t] = \sum_{\mathcal{E},\alpha} c_{\mathcal{E},\alpha}\Phi_{\mathcal{E},\alpha}[q]e^{i\sigma_0\mathcal{E}t/\hbar} \tag{59}$$

and inserting into (58), the condition of $\mathcal{N}$-independence implies

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{\mathcal{E}}G^{ab}\frac{\delta^2}{\delta q^a\delta q^b} + \sqrt{g}U\right]\Phi_{\mathcal{E},\alpha}[q] = 0 \tag{60}$$

which is a Wheeler-DeWitt equation (with the usual ordering ambiguity) parametrized by $\mathcal{E}$. This is the operator version of the constraint (55) corresponding to $\delta Æ/\delta\mathcal{N} = 0$; the label α distinguishes among a linearly independent set of solutions of this equation. The physical Hilbert space is thereby spanned by the solutions

[5] In vacuum gravity, where $\sqrt{g}U = -\sqrt{g}R/\kappa^2$, the undetermined constant $\mathcal{E}$ can be absorbed, by a scaling $\kappa^2_{new} = \kappa^2/\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}$, into an (undetermined) Newton's constant.

[6] The field equations are in $N_i = 0$ gauge, but with no restriction on foliation.

of a one-parameter ($\mathcal{E}$) *family* of Wheeler-DeWitt equations. A solution of any given Wheeler-DeWitt equation, with fixed $\mathcal{E}$, is a stationary state; it cannot be an eigenstate of non-stationary observables, such as 3-geometry or extrinsic curvature. However, a superposition of states $\Phi_{\mathcal{E},\alpha}$, with different $\mathcal{E}$, is a non-stationary state. Such states can indeed be eigenstates of non-stationary observables, and therefore have the possibility of, e.g., describing the outcome of a measurement process. All of this has been discussed in some detail in ref. [7]-[9]. But what we now see, from the work of the previous section, is that *the time parameter for quantum gravity in eq. (58) is, at the classical level, proportional to the proper-time of the trajectory of the Universe in superspace.*

5 Beyond Free Fall

The geodesic equation of motion in general relativity is the statement that the non-gravitational force on a particle is zero. The equivalent statement, in superspace, is that all dynamics is free fall; there no other forces in superspace that act on the Universe, viewed as a point particle. We have no motivation, from phenomenology, to go beyond this statement. Still, it is intriguing to consider what might be the form of the equations of motion if there *would* be some non-(super)gravitational forces in superspace, presumably so weak as to have gone undetected. In other words, what is the analog of $F = ma$ in superspace, and are there any consistency conditions that must be satisfied by such "superforces"?

The motion of a point particle in ordinary spacetime is governed by the equation

$$g_{\mu\nu}\frac{d^2x^\nu}{d\tau^2} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial g_{\mu\alpha}}{\partial x^\beta} + \frac{\partial g_{\mu\beta}}{\partial x^\alpha} - \frac{\partial g_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial x^\mu}\right)\frac{dx^\alpha}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\beta}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{m}F_\mu \tag{61}$$

The direct generalization to superspace is an equation of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}\frac{d^2q^{(\beta y)}}{dt^2} &+ \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\beta y)}}{\delta q^{(\gamma z)}} + \frac{\delta\mathcal{G}_{(\alpha x)(\gamma z)}}{\delta q^{(\beta y)}} - \frac{\delta\mathcal{G}_{(\beta y)(\gamma z)}}{\delta q^{(\alpha x)}}\right)\frac{dq^{(\beta y)}}{dt}\frac{dq^{(\gamma z)}}{dt} \\ &= \rho F_{(\alpha x)}\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where ρ is a constant, and $F_{(\alpha x)}$ is the "superforce." As before, the $\alpha = 0$ components of this equation are the equations of constraint, while the $\alpha \neq 0$ components are the equations of motion. The requirement that the equations of constraint are preserved by the motion leads to certain conditions on the form of the superforce.

In ordinary spacetime, the electromagnetic force acting on a charged particle preserves the mass-shell condition; i.e. the Hamiltonian constraint

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}p^2 + \frac{1}{2}m = 0 \tag{63}$$

is unchanged. Let us assume that this is also true in superspace, which would insure that the number of independent dynamical degrees of freedom is unaffected by the force term. This requires $F_{(0x)} = 0$. Then eq. (62) for $\alpha = a \neq 0$ becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left[\frac{1}{2\tilde{N}\kappa^2}G_{ab}\frac{dq^b}{dt}\right] - \frac{1}{4\tilde{N}\kappa^2}\frac{\partial G_{bc}}{\partial q^a}\frac{dq^b}{dt}\frac{dq^c}{dt} + \int d^3x' \; \tilde{N}\frac{\delta}{\delta q^a(x)}(\sqrt{g}U) = \frac{2\rho}{\sigma}F_{(ax)} \quad (64)$$

while the constraint, obtained from (62) with $\alpha = 0$,

$$\frac{1}{4\tilde{N}^2\kappa^2}G_{ab}\partial_t q^a \partial_t q^b + \sqrt{g}U = 0 \quad (65)$$

is unchanged.

Again define

$$\mathcal{H}_x = \kappa^2 G^{ab}p_a p_b + \sqrt{g}U \quad (66)$$

Then the equation of motions (64) and constraint (65) are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dq^{(ax)}}{dt} &= \int d^3x' \; \tilde{N}(x')\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_{x'}}{\delta p_{ax}} \\
\frac{dp_{(ax)}}{dt} &= -\int d^3x' \; \tilde{N}(x')\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_{x'}}{\delta q^{ax}} + \frac{2\rho}{\sigma}F_{(ax)} \\
\mathcal{H}_x &= 0
\end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Consistency of the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H}_x = 0$ with the other equations of motion in (67) then requires

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{d\mathcal{H}_x}{dt} \\
&= \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_x}{\delta q^{(ax')}}\frac{dq^{(ax')}}{dt} + \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_x}{\delta p_{(ax')}}\frac{dp_{(ax')}}{dt} \\
&= \int d^3x' \; \tilde{N}(x')\{\mathcal{H}_x, \mathcal{H}_{x'}\} \; + \; \frac{4\rho\kappa^2}{\sigma}G^{ab}p_a(x)F_b(x)
\end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Since the Poisson Bracket $\{\mathcal{H}_x, \mathcal{H}_{x'}\}$ is linear in the supermomentum density $\mathcal{H}^i_x$, consistency is obtained by imposing the usual supermomentum constraint

$$\mathcal{H}^i_x = 0 \quad (69)$$

on the canonical momenta, as well as the "orthogonality condition" on the force

$$p_a(x)F^a(x) \equiv G^{ab}p_a(x)F_b(x) = 0 \quad (70)$$

at each point x. But then, we also need to ensure that the supermomentum constraint is maintained by the equation of motion. This requires

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{d\mathcal{H}^i_x}{dt} \\
&= \int d^3x' \; \tilde{N}(x')\{\mathcal{H}^i_x, \mathcal{H}_{x'}\} \; + \; \frac{2\rho}{\sigma}\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}^i_x}{\delta p_{(ax')}}F_{(ax')}
\end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

The vanishing of the Poisson bracket $\{\mathcal{H}^i_x, \mathcal{H}_{x'}\}$ is guaranteed by the usual Dirac algebra, and $\mathcal{H}_x = 0$, so the above condition reduces to a supermomentum constraint on the force term

$$\mathcal{H}^i_x \left[p_a(x) \to F_a(x)\right] = 0 \tag{72}$$

where the notation means that the momenta in the supermomentum constraint are replaced by the corresponding components of the superforce. In short, a consistent force term in the superspace equations of motion which preserves the form of the constraints must: (1) be velocity-dependent, in the sense that the force is orthogonal to the canonical momenta at every point in 3-space; and (2) obey a supermomentum constraint. Altogether:

$$\begin{aligned} p_a(x)F^a(x) &= 0 \\ \mathcal{H}^i_x \left[F_a(x)\right] &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

The first of these conditions is reminiscent of the Lorentz force of electromagnetism,

$$F^\mu = eg^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\nu A_\lambda - \partial_\lambda A_\nu)\frac{dx^\lambda}{ds} \tag{74}$$

which is, in fact, orthogonal to the particle 4-momentum, i.e. $p_\mu F^\mu = 0$, in ordinary spacetime. This orthogonality is due to the antisymmetry of the electromagnetic field tensor, and it guarantees that the electromagnetic force leaves the 4-momentum of a charged particle on its mass shell: $H = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; p^2 + m^2 = 0$. The second condition, a super-momentum constraint on the force, has no obvious analog in particle dynamics.

6 Conclusions

The fact that the Einstein (+ other integer-spin) field equations can be reformulated as a single geodesic equation may be of interest aesthetically. More importantly, the formalism also suggests a natural evolution operator (and evolution parameter) for the corresponding quantum theory, which has obvious application to the problem of time. It would be interesting to see if this geodesic reformulation can also be extended to include spinor fields.

Beyond this, it is tempting to speculate that superspace should be regarded, rather literally, as a true arena of dynamics. The Universe is a point particle in this space, and it moves, under the influence of a (super)gravitational field, along a geodesic. If one particle can fall freely in superspace, why not others? Interactions among such particles would result in deviations from geodesic motion, as discussed

in the last section. This suggests that the geodesic equation in superspace, and its possible extensions, might be a natural starting point for constructing classical theories of multi-universe dynamics. The many-universe concept is not new in quantum gravity; in particular, it has been argued that wormhole processes are best described in the framework of third quantization [10]. A classical theory of multi-universe dynamics, if it could be constructed consistently, might well be the "particle limit" (in the sense of ref. [11]) of a corresponding third-quantized field theory, associated with topology-changing processes.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the hospitality of the theory group at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, where much of this work was carried out; I would also like to thank Alberto Carlini for helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, under Grant No. DE-FG03-92ER40711; support has also been provided by the Danish Natural Science Research Council.

References

[1] V. Moncrief and C. Teitelboim, Phys. Rev. D6 (1972) 966.

[2] R.F. Baierlein, D.H. Sharp, and J.A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. 126 (1962) 1864;
J. A. Wheeler, in *Relativity, Groups, and Topology*, ed. C. DeWitt and B. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1964).

[3] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, Phys. Rev. D40 (1989) 3312.

[4] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D40 (1989) 1048;
M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. B222 (1989) 195.

[5] C. Misner, K. Thorne and J. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).

[6] K. Kuchar, Time and interpretations of quantum gravity, *Proceedings of the 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Astrophysics*, ed. G. Kunstatter et. al. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992);
C. J. Isham, Imperial College preprint IMPERIAL-TP-91-92-25, archive: gr-qc/9210011.

[7] A. Carlini and J. Greensite, *Square Root Actions, Metric Signature, and the Path-Integral of Quantum Gravity*, Nordita preprint NORDITA-94/71 P, archive: gr-qc/9502023.

[8] A. Carlini and J. Greensite, Phys. Rev. D52 (1995) 936.

[9] J. Greensite, Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 930.

[10] S. Giddings and A. Strominger, Nucl. Phys. B321 (1989) 481;
V. Rubakov, Phys. Lett. B214 (1988) 503;
T. Banks, Nucl. Phys. B321 (1989) 481.

[11] M. B. Halpern and W. Siegel, Phys. Rev. D16 (1977) 2486.